

Application No. 09/944668
Page 8

Response
Attorney Docket No. S63.2B-9867-US01

Remarks

This Response is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 4, 2006. In the Final Office Action claims 41, 42, 44, and 45 have been allowed. Claims 1-4, 6-15, 30, and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by PG PUB 2002/0107560 to Richter. Claims 11-13, 35-37, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,591,223 to Lock et al. These rejections are addressed under headings consistent with the headings of the Office Action.

35 USC § 102

In the Final Office Action claims 1-4, 6-15, 30, and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by PG PUB 2002/0107560 to Richter. Applicant disagrees with this rejection. Claim 1 recites "the frangible temporary strut restraining at least two of the interconnected struts from self-expansion, at least a portion of the stent constructed and arranged to self-expand upon breaking of the at least one frangible temporary strut".

Richter is directed to a stent that has frangible members that break in order to separate the stent into sections. The frangible temporary struts do not restrain struts from self-expansion. As illustrated in FIGS 3-4 of Richter, the frangible struts 4 are disposed longitudinally between stent segments 2. There is no teaching in Richter that these frangible struts restrain self-expansion. The longitudinal placement of the frangible struts 4 between the stent segments suggests that the frangible struts would merely move along with the stent if the stent self-expanded.

Thus, Richter does not teach all the limitations of claim 1 and cannot anticipate claim 1 and those claims dependent thereof.

Independent claim 30 recites "the stent further comprising at least one frangible temporary strut disposed completely between at least two interconnected struts and restraining the interconnected struts from self-expansion, at least a portion of the stent capable of self-expanding upon breaking of the frangible temporary strut". Richter as stated above is directed to a stent that has frangible members that break in order to separate the stent into sections. There is no teaching in Richter that the stent is capable of self-expanding upon breaking of the frangible temporary strut.

Response
Attorney Docket No. S63.2B-9867-US01

[illegible]

Application No. 09/944668
Page 10

Response
Attorney Docket No. S63.2B-9867-US01


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing it is believed that the present application, with pending claims 1-15, 30, 33-42, 44, and 45, is in condition for allowance. Early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: June 9, 2006

By: 
Brendan C. Babcock
Registration No.: 50705

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\lcbcb\09867us01_amd_20060531.doc